

Whitefish Trust Land Plan Advisory Committee Meeting  
Thursday, January 8, 2004  
North Valley Hospital  
6-8pm

**Committee Members Attending**

Alan Elm, ReMax of Whitefish, Committee Chairman  
Sheila Bowen, Whitefish Chamber of Commerce  
Charlie Abell, Whitefish Credit Union  
Greg Gunderson  
Tyler Tourville, Flathead Fat Tire Club  
Rob Hedstrom, Whitefish Rifle Club  
Leesa Valentino  
Paul McKenzie, Stoltze Lumber  
Richard Marriott  
Donna Maddux, Superintendent, Flathead County Schools  
Shirley Jacobson (alternate)  
Jeff Gillman (alternate)  
Steve Lorch, DNRC  
David Greer, DNRC  
Andy Feury, Mayor of Whitefish

**Review of minutes from December:**

Committee would like the minutes to be available in a timely manner online for public review. Jen Bannon will coordinate with David Greer for information distribution.

Jeff clarifies technical details of action—elect chairperson and hire note-taker.

Change Janet has contract obligations not contact obligations.

January 22 agenda item will have comment period/feedback/questions on resource document.

**Expectations of Planning Document**

Committee has informal discussion to identify questions and concerns in establishing goals and policies for the Neighborhood Plan.

**Issues raised by the Advisory Committee**

- Difficulty grasping the mandate of maximizing best use vs. community interest and identifying where the balance falls

- Interest in hearing from the various “stakeholders” and experts, perhaps at each meeting
- Identify a framework and education process in prioritizing critical areas, habitat protection, timber management practices, hydrology, development and non-development values, current infrastructure for existing land-use, etc...by bringing in experts from the community
- Desire to identify specific watersheds on each subunit of study areas to protect resource into the next 100 years.
- Desire to understand fire risks, impacts of land -use on City Services
- Need to better understand Neighborhood Plans and Land-Use Planning process
- Interest in hearing goals for the Committee directly from the Land Board
- Identified the need for more details to be included with the maps in the Resource Document with emphasis on hydrology and watershed
- Uncertainty of the level of detail the Neighborhood Plan will address
- Expressed interest in developing a Plan that will be detailed and serve as a guiding document to identify critical and sensitive areas to protect and also to identify appropriate areas and specific uses to generate income for the Trust
- Plan will represent community values identified from summer public hearings
- Importance to identify tools in plan to protect sensitive areas and address community values
- Questions about different implementation strategies such as conservation easements, purchase of development rights, etc...DNRC is in the process of writing rules for conservation easements
- How to maximize the revenue for the Trust as to give up certain revenue to protect aesthetic value, environmental value, etc...on other pieces of the Trust land.

### **Action:**

Extend invitation to Land Board Staff to attend committee meeting to give input on what they would like to see come out of the process. Jen and Alan will meet to frame and draft letter to be circulated early next week via email.

### Discussion

DNRC explains there are two different kinds of neighborhood plans

1-Specific

2-Conceptual. Claims this plan would identify the framework for development of state lands. It would be goals and policy plan and will rule out some of the options due to community values, look closer at options for subareas such as cluster development, open space preservation, etc...

DNRC staff claims that DNRC intent was not to create a refined specificity with the plan. DNRC is nowhere close to envisioning any sort of development at all on these lands. Thinks what we can do is to just set some goals and policies and bring it down to a sub-neighborhood level that says these are the important features of this site, natural areas, maximize open space, etc... DNRC doesn't want to get to the point where they're drawing circles on the map saying this is going to be development.

What happens as we move along in the process and find that we agree that a certain area is natural for a certain kind of action to provide good revenue for the Trust. Do we want try to identify those things at this point?

Department responds that this is a whole different level of review which is a yearlong process. The idea of this whole thing was to get some idea of the point of view of the community, get it on paper and to achieve a general guidance so assist in making decisions on the Trust Lands. When the comprehensive plan is done, there will be a plan that is specific enough to tell us what we can and cannot do on this land. The Plan will provide guidance with safety nets of City and County plans as well as MEPA analysis.

Agenda items for January 22 meeting:

- Questions and comments on Resource Document
- Boil down Goals and Policies for Plan
- Feedback from Land Board
- Review maps from Resource Document
- Neighborhood Planning Process

**HOMEWORK for Committee:**

- Review November meeting notes for vision of Goals and Policies
- Read and prepare questions for Resource Document for next meeting

Adjourn—8pm